

faithless. The mother says, "he is *my boy*. I'll follow him with my prayers and with my influence while I live. I'll ever be mindful of him, because I *love* him even in his waywardness." God says of man he is my son. Tho he sold himself into bondage, yet I loved and redeemed him. He's coming back home, and he who casts reproach on his Father's name will some day glorify him and bring joy instead of grief to the heart of his Father. Why art thou mindful of him, thoughtful of him, careful of him? Why not let him take care of himself; take his chances in the race of life according to the Darwinian law of "survival of the fittest?"

Last winter the writer went with a friend into the green house, and as we were looking around at the plants and flowers my friend called my attention to the proprietor. He was near the center of the building looking very earnestly into a small box of earth, which he had placed there in the best light, and in the most favorable spot in the whole building for a plant to grow. See him; he takes his eye glass to examine something in the box where we could see nothing but dirt. I asked my friend if he knew what the man was looking at so intently. Smiling, almost sneering, he said, "O, he sees a little insignificant looking plant in that box, I guess its nothing but a weed. He has carefully watched it every day since it came thro the soil he fears that some parasite or fungus may injure it so you see he examines it each day with his glass."

Let us go around and see it, I said. We approached him unobserved, and when he raised his head to look at us I said almost involuntarily, what is that, that you are so careful of it? "Well sir, said he, I'm not surprised that you should ask that question, since you don't know what investment I have made, nor the interests I have at stake in that apparently trifling little thing. Neither do you appreciate as I do the outcome of it if I succeed in saving it. The facts briefly stated are, that it is a rare flower plant of great beauty. I sent away for a half dozen seeds, paid a large price for them, and this is the only one that came up for me. So you see the price I paid is at stake; my reputation as a florist is at stake; a large income from the seeds is at stake; besides the honor of giving to the florists of this country the rarest and handsomest flower of the world. That's why I'm so mindful of it. That it's so small and mean looking *now* is of no concern to me since I know what it *will* be when fully developed." So we apprehend that God might answer our question, that he is not mindful of man for what he is or seems to be now, but for what he knows of his capabilities in the future; and also for the price he has

paid. "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price."

Man, made a little lower than the angels, sold under sin, apprenticed to the devil, having obtained the experience of a bondservant to a hard master, bought back again, liberated by blood, pure, innocent blood, redeemed! What may he not now become? A reinstated heir of the ruler of the universe and joint heir with his (liberator) deliverer, Jesus Christ not a *servant* of the most high, but a *Son*, with all the privileges that belong to sonship. It means much to the Son and it means much to the Father. To man it means wealth and influence and power; it means the happiness and comforts of home, peaceful home, beautiful home, sweet home. To the Father it means glory and honor and praise. The angels understood something of it when they sang, "Glory to God in the highest, and (in heaven?) No, *on earth* peace, good will to men."

"Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God. It doth not *yet* appear what we shall be, but we *know*, that when he shall appear we shall be like *Him*."

THE LORD'S SUPPER. No. 7

G. W. RENCH

Was it to be perpetuated? Having shown in my last article that the apostles understood that the Supper was to be kept in the church, this being brought out by their teaching and reference to it, let us see how the early church understood the matter after the apostles had been called to their reward. We appeal to history. Most of the following selections from history have been made by various other writers.

Bingham, in referring to the collections of the saints for the widows, orphans, and the sick says, in referring to Justin Martyr, on page 752, "Only one part of it he adds, was sustained upon a sober feast of charity, where the poor had a right to feed as well as the rich."

On page 831 of Bingham, Dr. Cave says, "It is probable that in the apostles' time, and the age after them, this feast was before the communion, in imitation of our Savior's institution, who celebrated the sacrament after supper."

Mosheim, page 121, in speaking of the time when this Supper was dropped, says, "On the other hand the agape or feasts of charity were now suppressed on account of the abuses to which they gave occasion amidst the daily decline of that piety and virtue which had rendered these meetings useful and edifying in the primitive church."

Again, on page 833 of Bingham we learn how the Supper was put away. "However such abuses were committed in these feasts that the council of Laodicea not long after made a law against having them in the church, forbidding any to eat or spread tables in the house

of God or the church, and a like decree was made in the third council of Carthage, forbidding the clergy to feast in the church unless they were by chance on a journey." Here is the trouble, my brother. If you want to know why so few professing Christians observe this Supper now, don't go to Paul; go to the Roman Catholic church—to their councils of Laodicea and Carthage. Paul found the Corinthians abusing this feast but he corrected the abuse instead of suppressing the feast. Romanism took matters in her own hands as she has always tried to do, regardless of God and his word, and has almost succeeded in blotting out the feast. Thank God for a few faithful people who would rather be apostolic in their practice than "mighty in battle!"

In the Quinter and McConnell debate, on page 148, is a most excellent reference from Mosheim, that great church historian. "Mosheim," in his commentaries on the affairs of Christians before the time of Constantine the Great (Vol. I, p. 197), has the following remarks: in these solemn assemblies of the Christians, the "Kaimonia" or charitable contribution toward the relief of the necessitous was followed, according to St. Luke, by the breaking of bread. The expression "to break bread," when it occurs in the Acts of the Apostles is for the most part to be understood as signifying the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in which bread was broken and distributed: we are not, however, to consider it as exclusively referring to this ordinance of our Savior but as also implying that feast of love of which it was the customary practice of the Christians, even from the very first, always at the same time to partake. That these two things were thus associated together even in the very earliest infancy of Christianity, is clear from what is said by St. Luke in Acts 2: 46: For after having there told us that the brethren at Jerusalem continued daily in the breaking of bread at different houses, he immediately adds that "they did eat their food together, with joy and simplicity of heart." See also Acts 20: 11, where the breaking of bread, or the celebration of the Lord's Supper, is again clearly associated with a feast or repast of the Christians. It appears, therefore, that when, in compliance with our Savior's injunction, the Christians would break bread together, they also partook of a repast, in the nature of a supper. Their meals of this sort were distinguished by an holy mirth, arising out of the love of Christ and the brethren; but this hilarity had no connection whatever with anything like sensuality or intemperance. And this is what I understand St. Luke to mean by that simplicity of heart with which he states the Christians to have eaten their food. For what are we to understand by a